Nicholas E. Purpura
1802 Rue De La Port
Wall, New Jersey 07719
732 449 0856

Hon. Judge Leda Dunn Wettre
Martin Luther King Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse
50 Walnut Street
Newark, NJ 07101

December 23, 2016

To be made part of the Official Record

RE: *Purpura v. JPMorgan Chase et al.* Civil RICO Action No. 2:16-cv-03765

Dear Judge Wettre:

I come before you in the interest of justice. It is incontestable that the Defendants failed to answer Plaintiff's Complaint as mandated in ***FRCP*** Rule 8(b)(6), nor did Defendants' counsel answer Plaintiff's Opposition to their Motion to Dismiss as required by law in this RICO Complaint.

What has taken place is unequivocally clear, Defendants have committed fraud not only on Plaintiff, but in kind, on the "judicial machinery" itself. Through an 'unconscionable' scheme to deceive this Court, Defense counsel submitted 4-exhibits (A-D) that were proven to be misrepresentations as well as perjurious. The question is: Did Mr. Sampson verify said evidence as required by law? One does not know whether Mr. Evan Sampson, Esq., was given these documents and unknowingly submitted them as Exhibits 'assuming' their content to be authentic and unimpeachable. He has individually sworn no affidavit in support of their content, so that is for this Court to decide.

A review of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, paragraphs 18 to 28, shows Chase's claims are fatally flawed, and no remedy in law exists to fix those flaws. Plaintiff believes his Motion for Summary Judgment may not be "premature", as no further matter of triable fact exists before the Court

Plaintiff reminds this Honorable Court that Justice delayed, is Justice denied. Plaintiff does not believe it is this Court's intention to deny him Justice.

Please if at all possible can this action be expedited? Plaintiff and his wife Pray only to be able to live their lives without this "Sword of Damocles" hanging over our heads.

Respectfully submitted,

Thank you in advance for Your Honor's consideration.

Nicholas E. Purpura, Chaplain
cc: Buckley Madole, Evan Maxwell Sampson, Esq. Cert./return receipt

The Court construes this letter as a motion for reconsideration of its 9/21/16 Order. Such a motion is not timely under L. Civ. R. 7.1(i) and also does not satisfy the standard for granting reconsideration. It is accordingly denied. SO ORDERED. 1/4/17
Leda Wettre, USMJ